

**DETAILED ACTION**

This responds to the Office Communication mailed on May 12, 2010. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application in view of the following remarks.

Claims 1, 11, 17, 22, 24 have been amended. No new claims are added. Further examination and reconsideration of the presently claimed application is respectfully requested.

***Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112***

The Examiner stated that Claims 1-12, 14, 16-20 and 22-26 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner submits that it is unclear what the Applicant is claiming.

The Examiner submits that “a remote user display region” of claim 1 is unclear. The Examiner submits that it is unclear whether the display device has two separate remote user display regions, or they are the same display regions. Applicant has amended independent claim 1 to more clearly recite the claimed invention. In particular, the independent claim 1 has been amendment for “a remote user display region” to more clearly recite the claimed invention.

The Examiner submits that "taskbar region within the display region" of claim 1 is unclear. The Examiner submits that it is unclear which display region the Applicant is referring to, the "local user display region" or the "remote user display region" and it is unclear where the "desktop region" is located. Applicant has amended claim 1 to more clearly recite the claimed invention. In particular, the independent claim 1 has been amendment to recite “a taskbar region within the local user display region” to more clearly recite the claimed invention.

The Examiner submits that “maximize” and “most” of the local user display region as recited in claims 1, 17 and 22 are unclear. The Examiner submits that the specification does not adequately make clear, what portion of the display will be sent to the remote user. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The applicant respectfully submits that the details to independent claims 1, 17, and 22 can at least be found and understood from paragraphs [0021]-, [0024], [0033] – [0038], and Fig. 3A-3B. At least paragraph [0023] and [0024] from the Applicant’s application clearly overcomes the rejections cited by the Examiner. In some embodiments, the taskbar region can be resized to the user’s preference, or even completely closed. This allows the user to manage the desired display area by determining the division of the area between the desktop region and the taskbar. The taskbar region can also be completely outside of the desktop, so it cannot be obscured by any other application windows on the desktop. This obscuring occurs in the desktop region when a window is moved or expanded so that it covers another window display, making it partially or completely invisible to the user. In one embodiment, the user interface element placed in the taskbar region can be the same element used in the main collaborative application, so that the user is dealing with a consistent interface for all collaborative functions (paragraph [0023] and [0024]).

Although Applicant does not believe that independent claims 1, 17, and 22 as previously described in the prior submitted Office Action responses is unclear, purely in the interest of expediting the prosecution of the instant application, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 17, and 22 to more clearly recite the claimed invention. In particular, the independent claim 1 has been amendment to recite “wherein a local user is able to ~~maximize~~ resize the taskbar region

to efficiently use the taskbar region and use most of the local user display region on tasks related to session control and document previews that are not visible or accessible to a remote user."

Independent claims 17 and 22 recited similar amendments.

The Examiner submits that independent claim 22 at first requires distinct areas, but then states that the toolbar region includes the sharer desktop region. The Examiner submits that the areas will not be distinct as the claim requires. The Examiner further submits that the claim 22 describes "remaining portion," however, it is unclear what this remaining portion is. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner.

The applicant respectfully submits that the details to independent claims 1, 17, and 22 can at least be found and understood from paragraphs [0021]-, [0024], [0033] – [0038], and Fig. 3A-3B. At least paragraphs [0035] and [0038] from the Applicant's application clearly overcomes the rejections cited by the Examiner. In this embodiment, only the desktop region 323 of display 321 is shared and appears in window 334. Control area 326 is placed in taskbar region 322, which is not shared. Thus the sharer is able to use application sharing to share a view of the entire desktop region without restriction on the control area. In one embodiment, the sharer and viewer can each use their respective display areas to maximum benefit. The sharer is able to maximize the taskbar region and use most of the display on tasks related to session control, document previews, or other items that he does not wish to share, while the viewer is able to use most of the viewer display to view the shared region contents. Each benefits from having the majority of their display utilized for the task of most interest. This provides larger displays, improved communication, and reduced fatigue and eyestrain (paragraphs [0035] and [0038]).

Appl. No. 10/738,357  
Amdt. Dated 08/10/2010  
Reply to Office action of 05/12/2010

Applicant respectfully submits that Independent claims, as amended, are fully supported and enabled by the specification. Therefore, Applicant requests the withdrawal of the 112 rejection against independent claims 1, 17 and 22 and there dependencies.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at any time.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 08/10/2010

By: /Raffi Gostanian/  
Raffi Gostanian  
Reg. No. 42,595  
Tel: (972) 849-1310